

all miss him here so terribly much—his knowledge, his wit, his writing, his counsel, his love.

We will have him always, in our hearts, and on our shelves, as he ambles the catlines byways of heaven with his brothers—holding aloft the black-thorn cane their father brought from Ireland much more than a century ago.

It that really what heaven will be like? Remember, Dad called it a mystery. It is a concept beyond our mortal grasp. But I know how I'd like to think of it. I imagine that as Charles Andrew Brady entered the Light, he heard the sweet baritone of Jehovah say, "Well done, oh good and faithful servant."

CROW CREEK SIOUX TRIBE INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST FUND ACT OF 1995

HON. TIM JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1995

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to establish a trust fund within the Department of Treasury for the development of certain tribal infrastructure projects for the Crow Creek Tribe. These projects were outlined in previous legislation but were never completed due to limited funding sources. The Crow Creek Development trust fund would be capitalized from a percentage of hydropower revenues and would be capped at \$27.5 million. The tribe would then receive the interest from the fund to be used according to a development plan based on legislation previously passed by Congress, and prepared in conjunction with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 created five massive earthen dams along the Missouri River. This public works project, known as the Pick-Sloan Plan, has since provided flood control, irrigation, and hydropower for communities along the Missouri. Four of the Pick-Sloan dams are located in South Dakota.

The Impact of the Pick-Sloan plan on the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe has been devastating. Construction of the Big Bend and Fort Randall dams was severely detrimental to economic and agricultural development for the Crow Creek Tribe. Over 15,000 acres of the tribe's most fertile and productive land, the Missouri River wooded bottom lands, were inundated as a direct result of the Fort Randall and Big Ben dam construction. The tribal community has still not yet been adequately compensated for the economic deprivation brought about with Pick-Sloan.

Through the Big Bend Act of 1962, Congress directed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior to take certain actions to alleviate the problems caused by the destruction of tribal resources and displacement of entire communities. These directives were either carried out inadequately or not at all. The legislation I am introducing is the first step toward keeping the promises Congress made to the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe.

Congress established precedent for this legislation with the Three Affiliated Tribes and Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act of 1992. At that time, Congress determined that the U.S. Army Corps of Engi-

neers failed to provide adequate compensation to the tribes when their lands were acquired for the Pick-Sloan projects. There is little controversy on finding that the tribes bore an inordinate share of the cost of implementing the Pick-Sloan program. The Secretary of the Interior established the Joint Tribal Advisory Committee to resolve the inequities and find ways to finance the compensation of tribal claims. As a result, the Three Affiliated Tribes and Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act set up a recovery fund financed entirely from a percentage of Pick-Sloan power revenues.

The Crow Creek Sioux Tribe Infrastructure Development Fund Act of 1995 will enable the Crow Creek Tribe to address and improve their infrastructure and will provide the needed resources for further economic development at the Crow Creek Indian reservation.

This legislation has broad support in South Dakota. South Dakota Governor Bill Janklow strongly endorses this funding mechanism to develop infrastructure at the Crow Creek Sioux reservation. I am including a letter of support from Governor Janklow to be printed in the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support this important legislation and correct this historic injustice against the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,

June 22, 1995.

HON DUANE BIG EAGLE,

Chairman of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Post Office Box 50, Fort Thompson, South Dakota 57501

DEAR CHAIRMAN BIG EAGLE: Thank you for giving me a copy of the proposed federal legislation that requires the federal government to fulfill the commitments made to the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe in the Big Bend Act of 1962.

I wholeheartedly support this legislation and your efforts to develop Fort Thompson with the infrastructure and community facilities that the Crow Creek community should have received long ago. The method for funding in the bill is fair and I hope a majority of both houses of Congress and the President will realize the importance of passing this bill and signing it into law.

In several different ways, all of the various groups of people who live in South Dakota have not received the benefits promised when the great dams were built in the 1950s. The persistence of the members of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe to right this wrong is worthy of high praise. Congratulations on creating an excellent proposal.

If there is anything I can do to help you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JANKLOW,
Governor.

COALITION MEDICARE PROPOSAL

HON. BILL ORTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 19, 1995

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the coalition Medicare reform alternative. In doing so, I will be voting against both the Democratic and Republican Medicare reform proposals considered today. I would like to explain why.

Today, we are considering only the Medicare portion of the Republican budget reconciliation package. This separation of Medi-

care from the rest of the Republican budget proposal is an effort to convince the American people that reduced spending in Medicare is not related to the rest of the budget. It is an effort to convince the American people that a \$270 billion reduction in Medicare spending is necessary to address the impending insolvency of the Medicare HI trust fund in the year 2002. It is nonsense.

The bipartisan Concord Coalition perhaps said it best: It all began with the irreconcilable goals announced in the GOP's Contract With America: Balance the budget while at the same time enacting large tax cuts and pushing many large programs, most notably Social Security, off the table. Inevitably, a disproportionate share of the budget-cutting burden fell on Medicare.

The coalition Medicare reform proposal, of which I am a cosponsor, proves that the solvency of the Medicare HI trust fund can be restored, within the context of a 7-year balanced budget, while cutting \$100 billion less in Medicare spending than the Republican proposal. I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not make in order consideration of the coalition proposal on the House floor, because I believe it is closer to the priorities of the vast majority of Americans than either of the two proposals that we will be debating today.

The American people deserve a complete debate of the choices we face as a nation as we begin to balance the budget. Today, we will debate two options regarding Medicare: reducing Medicare spending by \$270 billion in the context of a budget that contains a \$245 billion tax cut, and reducing Medicare spending by \$90 billion in order to restore solvency to the Medicare trust fund without balancing the budget.

There is a responsible alternative that sadly will not receive consideration: restoring the solvency of the Medicare program within the context of a balance budget without providing an immediate tax cut. I believe that this option represents the preferences of the majority of Americans.

The coalition alternative includes many of the same proposals contained in the Republican proposal: it allows the formation of provider sponsored networks, it means-tests part B premiums, and it expands the choice of seniors within the Medicare system.

However, there are many distinctions. The Republican plan raises premiums on all senior citizens. The coalition only raises premiums for wealthier seniors who are better able to afford an increase. The coalition plan also protects reimbursement rates in rural areas where hospitals are more likely to close, continues minimal standards for nursing homes, and maintains eligibility for health care at military facilities.

Finally, unlike the Republican plan, we do not include \$35 billion in unspecified cuts, which the Republican Senate Finance Committee chairman labeled "blue smoke and mirrors."

We need to keep in mind two things when considering these proposals today: First, we cannot continue to borrow from future generations in order to have things we are not willing to pay for now, and second, we cannot overlook the needs of current generations as we set national fiscal priorities. I believe that the coalition alternative does the best job of balancing these two concerns.